

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-31 were submitted for examination. Claims 2, 3, 16, 17, 30 and 31 have been amended.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 2, 3, 16, 17, 30 and 31 have been amended to overcome the claim objections.

### **35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections**

Claims 1-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al (Hereinafter, "Smith"), U.S. Pat. No. 6,697,842. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

### **CLAIM 1**

Smith at least fails to teach "receiving at least one information item separate from the first plurality of information items" and "forming a second plurality of information items including the first plurality of information items and the at least one information item" as recited in Claim 1.

The Office Action dated July 28, 2005 asserts that Smith discloses these elements with reference to Fig. 1 and the Abstract "transferring data from the server to the mobile client via a service provider. Smith does not disclose receiving an information item separate from the first plurality of information items. Thus, Smith cannot also disclose forming a second plurality of information items including the first plurality of information items and the at least one information item.

The Office Action fails to present a prima facie case of anticipation for Applicants' claims. "[F]or anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference must teach *every aspect* of the claimed invention ..." MPEP 706.02 (emphasis added). Smith simply fails to disclose every aspect of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Smith fails to teach the limitations of Claim 1. The rejection of Claim 1 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 2-14 depend from allowable Claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason.

### **CLAIM 15**

Smith at least fails to teach "receiving at least one information item separate from the first plurality of information items" and "forming a second plurality of information items including the first plurality of information items and the at least one information item" as recited in Claim 15.

Claim 15 was rejected on similar grounds as Claim 1. As illustrated above with respect to Claim 1, Smith simply fails to disclose every aspect of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Smith fails to teach the limitations of Claim 15. The rejection of Claim 15 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 16-28 depend from allowable Claim 15 and are allowable for at least this reason.

### **CLAIM 29**

Smith at least fails to teach "a second unit, connected to the first unit, to receive at least one information item separate from the first plurality of information items" and "a third unit, connected to the second unit, to form a second plurality of information items

including the first plurality of information items and the at least one information item” as recited in Claim 29.

Claim 29 was rejected on similar grounds as Claim 1. As illustrated above with respect to Claim 1, Smith simply fails to disclose every aspect of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Smith fails to teach the limitations of Claim 29. The rejection of Claim 29 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn.

Claims 30-31 depend from allowable Claim 29 and are allowable for at least this reason.

### **Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: October 26, 2005                      /Rita M. Wisor/ Reg. No. 41,382                     

Rita M. Wisor  
Reg. No. 41,382

Attorney Phone Number: (512) 732-3923

Correspondence Address: Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026